



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,898	04/17/2000	Hirokazu Aoshima	ASA-878	1272

24956 7590 03/27/2003

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.
1800 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 370
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BURGESS, BARBARA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/550,898

Applicant(s)

AOSHIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Barbara N Burgess

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3, 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 9-11, 12, 22-24, 25, 28--33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Brandt et al. (hereinafter "Brandt", 6,125,384).

As per claims 1, 9-10, 12, 22-23, 25, 28, 30-33, Brandt discloses an information distributing method of distributing information via a communication path to an information user unit, comprising the steps of:

- Receiving a first request from the information user unit (column 5, lines 8-10, 27-37, 45-48, 60-64, column 7, lines 61-64, column 9, lines 10-14, column 11, lines 13-17);
- Receiving first information from a first information providing resource (column 5, lines 27-48, 54-59, 65-67, column 6, lines 20-29, column 9, lines 1-3, 52-54, column 14, lines 5-8);



Art Unit: 2157

- Transmitting a predetermined program code to the information user unit according to the first request (column 5, lines 27-48, 54-59, 65-67, column 6, lines 20-29, column 9, lines 1-3, 52-54, column 14, lines 5-8);
- Receiving a second request to receive from a second information providing resource second information quoted in the first information and transmitted from the information user unit using the program code (column 7, lines 1-7, 61-67, column 8, lines 17-26, column 9, lines 11-27, column 11, lines 13-35, column 13, lines 51-61, column 15, lines 22-67);
- Determining in response to the second request whether or not the second request is allowed according to at least identifying information (URI) included in the second request (column 8, lines 30-35, 51-59, column 9, lines 11-55, column 11, lines 13-21, 28-44, column 13, lines 51-64, column 15, lines 22-25, 40-50, 55-67, column 16, lines 1-20).

As per claims 11, 24, and 29, discloses:

- When the first information providing resource and the second information providing resource are implemented by a common server, said server distributes the first information via the communication path to a client as the information user unit and distributes, if the determining step allows the second request, the second information quoted in the first information to the client

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-5, 13-17, 26, and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (hereinafter "Brandt", 6,125,384) in view of Felciano et al. (hereinafter "Felciano", 6,052,730).

As per claims 2, 13, and 34, Brandt does not explicitly disclose wherein the determining step determines whether or not the second request is allowed according to:

- Database including a correspondence between an identifier code (ID) specifying second information for which quotation is allowed in the second information providing resource and an identifier of first information in the first information providing source.

However, the use and advantages for using such database is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Felciano (column 2, lines 10-26, column 4, lines 44-67).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate a database in Brandt's method



Art Unit: 2157

in order to track the browser patterns of the client even when the client follows links to HTML documents on other servers.

As per claims 3, 14, 26, and 35, Brandt further discloses wherein:

- The program code has a password (column 9, lines 19-27, 32-36, 44-46, column 11, lines 35-44, column 15, lines 62-67, column 16, lines 1-13);
- Second request includes an identifier code to identify the second information to be quoted and the password (column 9, lines 19-27, 32-36, 44-46, column 11, lines 35-44, column 15, lines 62-67, column 16, lines 1-13);
- Determining step further includes a step of collating the password in the second request received from the information user unit with a valid password (column 9, lines 19-27, 32-36, 44-46, column 11, lines 35-44, column 15, lines 62-67, column 16, lines 1-13).

As per claims 4, 15, 17, and 36, Brandt does not explicitly disclose wherein the determining step allows:

- The identifier code to identify the second information is included in the database.

However, the use and advantages for including this information in the database is well known to one skilled in the relevant art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Felciano (column 2, lines 10-26, column 4, lines 44-67).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate including in the database the identifier code



Art Unit: 2157

to identify second information in Brandt's method in order to track the browser patterns of the client even when the client follows links to HTML documents on other servers.

As per claims 5, 16, and 37, Brandt further discloses including a step:

- Frequently changing a password in a program code to be sent to the information user unit (column 9, lines 19-27, 32-36, 44-46, column 11, lines 35-44, column 15, lines 62-67, column 16, lines 1-13).

5. Claims 6-8, 18-21, 27, 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al. (hereinafter "Brandt", 6,125,384) in view of Felciano et al. (hereinafter "Felciano", 6,052,730) and in further view of Savage.

As per claims 6, 8, 18, 20, 27, 38, and 40, Brandt, in view of Felciano, does not explicitly disclose wherein:

- Program code includes an encryption key to encrypt the second request;
- Second request includes information obtained by encrypting an identifier code to identify the second information according to the encryption key;
- The determining step further includes a step of verifying to determine whether or not the second request can be decoded;
- Frequently changing an encryption key in a program code to be sent to the information user unit



Art Unit: 2157

However, in an analogous art, Savage discloses the use of an encryption key (column 3, lines 32-54, column 5, lines 33-38, 65-67, column 6, lines 19-228, 41-46, 64-76).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate the use of an encryption key in Brandt's method so that third parties monitoring network traffic going to or coming from any of the servers in the system facility, either legally or illegally, are never able to connect an action taken by the server to the identity of a user who is connected to the server.

As per claims 7, 19 and 39, Felciano further discloses wherein the determining step allows:

- Second request when the second request can be decoded and the identifier code to identify the second information is included in the database (column 2, lines 10-26, column 4, lines 44-67).

As per claim 21, Felciano further discloses:

- Including a database for storing therein a certain number of previous encryption keys and a current encryption key (column 2, lines 10-26, column 4, lines 44-67).

Art Unit: 2157

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N Burgess whose telephone number is (703) 305-3366. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Ettinene can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

March 23, 2003


ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100